MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC

103 Eisenhower Parkway, Suite 207, Roseland, NJ 07068 Phone: (973) 228-9898 - Fax: (973) 228-0303 www.mazieslater.com

David A. Mazie*
Adam M. Slater*°
Eric D. Katz*°
David M. Freeman
Beth G. Baldinger
Matthew R. Mendelsohn°
David M. Estes

Certified by the Supreme Court of New Jersey as a Civil Trial Attorney Karen G. Kelsen° Cheryll A. Calderon Adam M. Epstein° Cory J. Rothbort° Michael R. Griffith° Christopher J. Geddis Samuel G. Wildman Julia S. Slater°

°Member of N.J. & N.Y. Bars

July 23, 2021

VIA ECF AND EMAIL

TIV@stevenslee.com

Hon. Thomas I. Vanaskie (Ret.) Special Master Stevens & Lee 1500 Market St., East Tower, Suite 1800 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-7360

> Re: In re Valsartan, Losartan, and Irbesartan Liability Litigation, Case No. 1:19-md-02875-RBK (D.N.J.)

Dear Judge Vanaskie:

Please accept this letter on behalf of the Plaintiffs as a request to submit a reply to ZHP's brief regarding its waiver of certain confidentiality designations. Plaintiffs' request is directed to the request in that brief to strike Plaintiffs' initial brief on this issue.

After Plaintiffs' filing of their brief, ZHP reached out to Plaintiffs' counsel to point out the late filing of the brief by two days, and requested that Plaintiffs accordingly agree to a commensurate two day extension for ZHP to file its responsive brief, to which Plaintiffs consented. This was then confirmed with the Court. (See Ex. A). Thus, Plaintiffs were surprised to see the argument to strike Plaintiffs' brief, and accordingly request denial of this request, which is

Case 1:19-md-02875-RMB-SAK Document 1406 Filed 07/23/21 Page 2 of 2 PageID: 32789

Hon. Thomas I. Vanaskie, Special Master July 23, 2021 Page 2

inconsistent with ZHP's consent to the filing conditioned on the two-day extension accorded to ZHP.

Plaintiffs' arguments and recitation of the immutable facts and dates that establish waiver, and demonstration that the Court should reject ZHP's tortured interpretation of the procedure set forth in the Confidentiality and Protective Order, should be considered in full.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Adam M. Slater